

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected the claims basically as unpatentable over Wischhusen, et al. This rejection is traversed since Wischhusen, et al. is directed to a food container and is non-analogous art and is not seeking a solution to the problem solved by the present application. Applicant's problem was to make a heavy duty meter box lid that would not break or crack. A solution to this problem is set forth in the specification and claims of this application. Wischhusen, et al. and the other two references to Conti and Frank are directed to light food containers which have nothing to do with the Applicant's problems. Reference is made to the MPEP Section 2141.01(a), and to Patent Law Fundamental, Peter D. Rosenberg, Section 9.03, 2001 revision, for a discussion of non-analogous art, copies of which are enclosed. Moreover, claims 5, 18, 25, and their dependent claims and claims 36, 38, 41, 43, 45, 47, 48, and 50 all require the lid to be capable of supporting a load of at least 8, 000 pounds which clearly cannot be accomplished by the food containers of Wischhusen, et al., Conti or Frank. The structure of these claims is supported by page 4 of the specification. Wischhusen, et al. disclose a container and lid made of two types of plastic, the interior plastic being formed of a foam whereas claims 37-40, 42, 43, 46, 47, 49, and 50 require the member of the lid to be made of a single type of plastic.

Claims 1-4 and their dependent claims require the lower surface area to be greater than the total area surrounded by the outer edges of the recesses. This is not present in either the lids or the trays of Wischhusen, et al. since as shown in Figs. 7 and 8 the areas of the recesses obviously are greater than the lower surface or upper surface of the lid or tray. Thus clearly any 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of these claims is improper.

Claims 23, 24, 26-35 all require the recesses to have triangular surfaces which provides strength to the lid. Wischhusen, et al. do not disclose or suggest lids with this structure. Neither do Frank or Conti. Conti in Fig. 5 discloses a cover 21 with a surrounding wall 26 but not the recesses of claims 23, 24, 26-35 which have two long sides and two short sided. The walls 26 of Conti are provided to facilitate stacking but do not

accommodate anything. If the covers 21 of Conti were used in Wischhusen, et al. they would not accommodate anything either since they are way off to one side of the trays. Moreover stacking trays has nothing to do with recesses in lids for meter boxes and clearly is non-analogous subject matter.

Claims 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, and 50 all require the lid to be capable of supporting a load of at least 8,000 pounds which clearly cannot be accomplished by the containers of Wischhusen, et al., Conti and Frank. The structure of these claims is supported by page 4 of the specification.

Thus it is submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and such allowance is requested.

Enclosed is a check in the amount of \$135.00 for the additional claims.

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and such allowance is requested.

If any additional fees are required, please charge our deposit account No. 23-2770.

Respectfully submitted,



Arthur F. Zobal, Reg. No. 20,616

Decker, Jones, McMackin, McClane, Hall & Bates, P.C.

Burnett Plaza

801 Cherry Street, Suite 2000

Fort Worth, Texas 76102-6836

PH: 817.336.2400, Fax: 817.332.3043

Attorney For Applicant